

In the United States Court of Federal Claims  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS  
No. 17-892V  
Filed: January 21, 2020

\* \* \* \* \*

BARBARA FANTELL, as mother and natural guardian of minor, H.F., and	*
SCOTT FANTELL, as father and natural guardian of minor, H.F.,	*
	UNPUBLISHED
Petitioner,	*
	*
v.	*
	Attorneys' Fees and Costs
	*
SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,	*
	*
	*
Respondent.	*
* * * * *	*

*Jeffrey Pop, Esq.*, Jeffrey S. Pop & Associates, Beverly Hills, CA, for petitioner.

*Daniel Principato, Esq.*, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

**DECISION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

**Roth**, Special Master:

On June 29, 2017, Barbara and Scott Fantell ("petitioners") filed a petition pursuant to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program on behalf of their minor child, H.F.<sup>2</sup> Petitioners alleged that H.F. developed idiopathic thrombocytopenia purpura ("ITP") after receiving measles-mumps-rubella ("MMR"), inactivated poliovirus ("HPV"), and meningococcal ("MCV") vaccinations on or about February 13, 2015. Stipulation at ¶¶ 1-4, ECF

---

<sup>1</sup> The undersigned intends to post this Ruling on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website. **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the Internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access. Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned is required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services).

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755.

No. 33. On May 31, 2019, the parties filed a stipulation, which the undersigned adopted as her Decision awarding damages on the June 3, 2019. ECF No. 34.

On September 20, 2019, petitioners filed an application for attorneys' fees and costs. ECF No. 37 ("Fees App."). Petitioners request total attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of \$37,294.87 (representing \$22,577.40 in attorneys' fees and \$14,717.47 in costs). Fees App. Ex. 2 at 2. Pursuant to General Order No. 9, petitioners warrant that they have not incurred any costs in pursuit of this litigation. Fees App. Ex. 6 at 1. Respondent responded to the motion on October 4, 2019, stating "Respondent is satisfied the statutory requirements for an award of attorneys' fees and costs are met in this case" and requesting that the undersigned "exercise her discretion and determine a reasonable award for attorneys' fees and costs." Response at 2-3, ECF No. 40. Petitioners did not file a reply thereafter.

This matter is now ripe for consideration.

## **I. Legal Framework**

The Vaccine Act permits an award of "reasonable attorneys' fees" and "other costs." § 15(e)(1). If a petitioner succeeds on the merits of his or her claim, the award of attorneys' fees is automatic. *Id.*; see *Sebelius v. Cloer*, 133 S. Ct. 1886, 1891 (2013). However, a petitioner need not prevail on entitlement to receive a fee award as long as the petition was brought in "good faith" and there was a "reasonable basis" for the claim to proceed. § 15(e)(1). Here, because petitioners were awarded compensation, they are entitled to a reasonable award of attorneys' fees and costs.

The Federal Circuit has endorsed the use of the lodestar approach to determine what constitutes "reasonable attorneys' fees" and "other costs" under the Vaccine Act. *Avera v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 515 F.3d 1343, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2008). Under this approach, "an initial estimate of a reasonable attorneys' fees" is calculated by "multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation times a reasonable hourly rate." *Id.* at 1347–48 (quoting *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 888 (1984)). That product is then adjusted upward or downward based on other specific findings. *Id.*

Special masters have substantial discretion in awarding fees and may adjust a fee request *sua sponte*, apart from objections raised by respondent and without providing petitioners with notice and opportunity to respond. See *Sabella v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 209 (2009). Special masters need not engage in a line-by-line analysis of petitioner's fee application when reducing fees. See *Broekelschen v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 102 Fed. Cl. 719, 729 (2011).

## **II. Discussion**

### **A. Reasonable Hourly Rate**

A "reasonable hourly rate" is defined as the rate "prevailing in the community for similar services by lawyers of reasonably comparable skill, experience and reputation." *Avera*, 515 F.3d at 1348 (quoting *Blum*, 465 U.S. at 896 n.11). In general, this rate is based on "the forum rate for

the District of Columbia” rather than “the rate in the geographic area of the practice of petitioner’s attorney.” *Rodriguez v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 632 F.3d 1381, 1384 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *Avera*, 515 F. 3d at 1349). There is a “limited exception” that provides for attorney’s fees to be awarded at local hourly rates when “the bulk of the attorney’s work is done outside the forum jurisdiction” and “there is a very significant difference” between the local hourly rate and forum hourly rate. *Id.* This is known as the *Davis County* exception. *See Hall v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 640 F.3d 1351, 1353 (2011) (citing *Davis Cty. Solid Waste Mgmt. & Energy Recovery Special Serv. Dist. v. U.S. EPA*, 169 F.3d 755, 758 (D.C. Cir. 1999)).

For cases in which forum rates apply, *McCulloch* provides the framework for determining the appropriate hourly rate range for attorneys’ fees based upon the attorneys’ experience. *See McCulloch v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 09-293V, 2015 WL 5634323 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Sept. 1, 2015). The Office of Special Masters has accepted the decision in *McCulloch* and has issued a Fee Schedule for subsequent years.<sup>3</sup>

Petitioners request the following hourly rates for the work of their counsel: for Mr. Jeffrey Pop, \$420.00 per hour for work performed in 2017-2018 and \$453.00 per hour for work performed in 2019; and for Ms. Kristina Grigorian, \$250.00 per hour for work performed in 2017-2018, and \$292.00 per hour for work performed in 2019. The rates requested herein have previously been found to be reasonable. *See Jones v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 18-160V, 2019 WL 2454058, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Apr. 5, 2019); *Owens v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 17-709V, 2019 WL 2635688, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Apr. 16, 2019). Accordingly, no adjustment to the requested rates is necessary.

## B. Hours Reasonably Expended

Attorneys’ fees are awarded for the “number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation.” *Avera*, 515 F.3d at 1348. Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are “excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.” *Saxton ex rel. Saxton v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). “Unreasonably duplicative or excessive billing” includes “an attorney billing for a single task on multiple occasions, multiple attorneys billing for a single task, attorneys billing excessively for intra office communications, attorneys billing excessive hours, [and] attorneys entering erroneous billing entries.” *Raymo v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 129 Fed. Cl. 691,

---

<sup>3</sup> The 2015-2016 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:

<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys-Forum-Rate-Fee-Schedule2015-2016.pdf>. The 2017 Fee Schedule can be accessed at: <http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys-Forum-Rate-Fee-Schedule-2017.pdf>. The 2018 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:

<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys%27%20Forum%20Rate%20Fee%20Schedule%202018.pdf>.

The 2019 Fee Schedule can be accessed at:

<http://www.cofc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Attorneys%27%20Forum%20Rate%20Fee%20Schedule%202019.pdf>. The hourly rates contained within the schedules are updated from the decision in *McCulloch v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 09-293V, 2015 WL 5634323 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Sept. 1, 2015).

703 (2016). While attorneys may be compensated for non-attorney-level work, the rate must be comparable to what would be paid for a paralegal or secretary. *See O'Neill v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 08–243V, 2015 WL 2399211, at \*9 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Apr. 28, 2015). Clerical and secretarial tasks should not be billed at all, regardless of who performs them. *See, e.g., McCulloch*, 2015 WL 5634323, at \*26. Hours spent traveling are ordinarily compensated at one-half of the normal hourly attorney rate. *See Scott v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 08–756V, 2014 WL 2885684, at \*3 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. June 5, 2014) (collecting cases). And “it is inappropriate for counsel to bill time for educating themselves about basic aspects of the Vaccine Program.” *Matthews v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, No 14–1111V, 2016 WL 2853910, at \*2 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Apr. 18, 2016). Ultimately, it is “well within the Special Master’s discretion to reduce the hours to a number that, in [her] experience and judgment, [is] reasonable for the work done.” *Saxton*, 3 F.3d at 1522. In exercising that discretion, special masters may reduce the number of hours submitted by a percentage of the amount charged. *See Broekelschen*, 102 Fed. Cl. at 728–29 (affirming the Special Master’s reduction of attorney and paralegal hours); *Guy v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 38 Fed. Cl. 403, 406 (1997) (same).

The overall hours spent on this matter appear to be reasonable. The undersigned has reviewed the billing entries and finds that the billing entries adequately describe the work done on the case and the amount of time spent on that work. None of the entries appear objectionable and Respondent has not identified any entries as objectionable either. Accordingly, petitioners are entitled to a final award of attorneys’ fees in the amount of **\$22,577.40**.

### C. Reasonable Costs

Like attorneys’ fees, a request for reimbursement of attorneys’ costs must be reasonable. *Perreira v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 27 Fed. Cl. 29, 34 (Fed. Cl. 1992). Petitioners request a total of \$14,717.47 in costs. Fees App. Ex. 2 at 2. This amount is comprised of acquiring medical records, postage, the Court’s filing fee, work performed by petitioners’ expert, Dr. Joseph Lasky, and guardianship work performed by Grant Fridkin Pearson. All of these costs are reasonable in the undersigned’s experience and petitioner has provided adequate documentation supporting all costs. Petitioner shall therefore be reimbursed in full for attorneys’ costs.

### III. Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, petitioners’ motion for attorneys’ fees and costs is **GRANTED**. I find that petitioners are entitled to an award of attorneys’ fees and costs as follows:

- 1) \$37,294.87, representing reimbursement for petitioners’ attorneys’ fees and costs, in the form of a check payable jointly to petitioners and Mr. Jeffrey Pop, Esq.**

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court shall enter judgment in accordance herewith.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Entry of judgment can be expedited by each party’s filing of a notice renouncing the right to seek review. Vaccine Rule 11(a).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Mindy Michaels Roth**

Mindy Michaels Roth

Special Master